# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,580	01/27/2004	Marina V. Backer	102108-300	1535
WIGGIN AND		EXAMINER		
ATTENTION: PATENT DOCKETING ONE CENTURY TOWER, P.O. BOX 1832 NEW HAVEN, CT 06508-1832			HAYES, ROBERT CLINTON	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1649	
CHORTENED STATISTORY	A BEDIOD OF BESDONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY	W MODE
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE MAIL DATE		DELIVER	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/05/2007	PAPER	

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/765,580	BACKER ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Robert C. Hayes, Ph.D.	1649				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period versions of the provided period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	•					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 N	ovember 2006.					
/ <u> </u>	action is non-final.	•				
, <u> </u>						
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-10,15-21,23 and 25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>22 and 24</u> is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5 and 11-14</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) 1-25 are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	)-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau	•					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
,	• * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *					
Attachment(s)		•				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) D Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate				
B) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/27/04</u> .	5)	atent Application				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	,					

Art Unit: 1649

# **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I (claims 1-5, 11-14, 22 & 24) in the reply filed on 11/13/06 is acknowledged.

Claims 6-10, 15-21, 23 & 25 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 11/13/06.

# Allowable Subject Matter

2. Claims 22 & 24 are allowed.

## Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-5 & 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The specification describes the human VEGF nucleic acid of SEQ ID NO: 10 and the Shiga-like toxin 1 (SLT-1) nucleic acid of SEQ ID NO: 9. No other nucleic acid molecules are described, especially as it relates to "mutated versions thereof", except for a "double mutant A-

Application/Control Number: 10/765,580

Art Unit: 1649

subunit with Y114S and R170L amino acid substitutions that... [do] not affect its folding as judged by antigenic properties" being mentioned on page 9 of the specification. However, how this double mutation relates to the nucleic acid molecule of SEQ ID NO: 9 is unknown, and not described. Page 18 of the specification further states that "[a]s used herein, VEGF refers to polypeptides having amino acid sequences of native VEGF proteins, as well as modified sequence, having amino acid substitutions, deletions, insertions or additions of the native protein..., but are not limited to, VEGF121, VEGF165, VEGF189, VEGF209", which are further not described. Page 19 of the specification then states that "[i]t is understood that differences in amino acid sequences can occur among VEGFs of different species as well as among VEGFs from individual organisms or different species. Reference to VEGFs is also intended to encompass proteins isolated from natural sources as well as those made synthetically, as by recombinant means or possibly by chemical synthesis".

The issue then becomes that although the specification only describes the single specific human species polynucleotide of SEQ ID NO: 10 (and the Shiga-like toxin molecule of SEQ ID NO: 9), "truncated" versions of either of these SEQ ID NOs can reasonably be visualized. However as indicated above, no generic functional "mutated" sequences can reasonably be visualized by the skilled artisan (i.e., as it relates to VEGF & SLT-1 "mutated versions thereof"). Likewise, no sequences from any VEGFs from "different species" can reasonably be visualized, because none are described. To provide evidence of possession of a claimed genus, the specification must provide sufficient distinguishing identifying characteristics of the genus. The factors to be considered include disclosure of complete or partial structure, physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics, structure/function correlation, methods of making the claimed product, or any combination thereof. Thus, in the absence of sufficient recitation of distinguishing identifying characteristics, the specification does not provide adequate written description of the claimed genus of nucleic acids encoding fusion proteins because one skilled in the art can not structurally visualize or predict what critical encoded amino acid residues would structurally characterize the genus of nucleic acids encoding a functional VEGF-SLT-1 fusion protein, as currently claimed; thereby, not reasonably meeting the written description requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. See MPEP 2163.

4. Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is ambiguous what exactly is being claimed because base claim 11 (1) recites "or a truncated or mutated versions thereof", whereas "the nucleic acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 11" is a specific sequence, and does not encompass any "truncated or mutated versions thereof", by definition; thereby, being contradictory.

### Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Robert Hayes whose telephone number is (571) 272-0885. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres, can be reached on (571) 272-0867. The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/765,580

Art Unit: 1649

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Robert C. Hayes, Ph.D.

January 22, 2007

ROBERT C. HAYES, PH.D. PRIMARY EXAMINER